REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the consideration given the present application. Claims 2, 8, 11, 14-16, 19, 22, 24, 25, and 26 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant reserving the right to file one or more continuing applications directed to the subject matter of these claims. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 27, and 28 are pending, of which claims 1, 7, 27, and 28 are independent.

Reconsideration is requested of the rejections in the Office Action for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claim Objections

The objections to claims 11, 14-16, 19, 21, and 24-26 as being substantial duplicates of other claims are rendered moot by the cancellation of claims 11, 14-16, 19, 22, 24-26. Withdrawal of the objections is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Present Invention

The present invention is directed to a chamber lamp socket 3 for a refrigerator. Chamber lamp socket 3 includes socket main body 4, support member 5, and lamp holder 8 for receiving a chamber lamp 2. Support member 5 is formed of a flexible synthetic resin. Tip cylindrical portion

Serial No. 10/562,003 Docket No. 050786

Page 10

5A extends upwards from the socket main body 4 and includes, on its inner surface, sawtoothed

portion 19 having gentle slopes 17 and steep slopes 18. Due to this structure, the holding force on

chamber lamp 2 increases, and rotation of chamber lamp 2 is prevented when exposed to the

vibrations caused by opening and closing of refrigerating chamber door 107 and the operation of the

refrigerator.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11, and 14-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being

unpatentable over Kokubu et al. (JP 2002-164138) in view of Murphy (U.S. 819,702) and

Gustavsson (DE 3217254).

Kokubu et al. (JP 2002-164138) describes a flexible collar part 1d having projections 1e

which closely contact a glass bulb 2 to prevent sparks from a socket 1. However, certain

disadvantages are associated with the collar of Kokubu. Prolonged use over time causes collar

part 1d to strongly adhere to glass bulb 2, making it difficult to remove bulb 2 from socket 1.

By contrast, even if Applicant's claimed invention is damaged due to use over time, it is

not difficult to remove the bulb from the socket due to unevenness provided on the inner surface

of the flexible collar portion.

-10**-**

Murphy describes a lamp revolution locking mechanism, in which teeth 19 and catch 27 prevent the lamp from revolving. However, the structure and movement of the Murphy mechanism is different from Applicant's claimed invention, at least because the catch 27 is required for the teeth 19, so that teeth 19 are not effective. Further, such a locking mechanism, the teeth 19 and catch 27 must be made of hard material which results in the above problems occurring.

Nowhere does Murphy disclose or suggest an unevenness as recited in the independent claims. Specifically, it is not 'unevenness provided on an inner surface of the flexible collar which is brought into contact with the outer periphery of the glass tube.

Gustavsson (DE 3217254 A) shows a color made to highly contact with the glass tube is only shown. So it is not shown that the unevenness which contacts to the glass tube is provided on the inner surface of the collar horizontal to a vertical axis to make it easy to remove the glass tube from the socket.

Accordingly, withdrawal is requested of claims 1-5, 7-9, 11, and 14-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kokubu et al. (JP 2002-164138) in view of Murphy (U.S. 819,702) and Gustavsson (DE 3217254).

Claims 6, 10, 12, 13, 24-26 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kokubu et al. (JP 2002-164138), Murphy (US 819,702 A) and Gustavsson (DE 3217254 A) as applied to claims 3, 9, 1, 7, and 14 above and further in view of Hawes et al. (US 3,915,328 A).

Hawes et al. describes a frame like collar assembly being made of polyvinyl chloride.

Claims 6, 10, 12, 13, 24-26 and 28 are allowable by virtue of their dependence from allowable independent claims. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6, 10, 12, 13 and 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kokubu et al. (JP 2002-164138), Murphy (US 819,702 A) and Gustavsson (DE 3217254 A) as applied to claims 3, 9, 1, 7, and 14 above and further in view of Hawes et al. (US 3,915,328 A) is respectfully requested.

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kokubu et al. (JP 2002-164138) in view of Hawes et al. (US 3,915,328 A).

Hawes et al. is non-analogous art. No motivation exists in either Kokubu et al. nor

Hawes et al. to combine the these references. Therefore, the Examiner's motivation to combine
these references is respectfully traversed.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kokubu et al. (JP 2002-164138) in view of Hawes et al. (US 3,915,328 A) is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the pending are allowable, and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

In the event this paper is not timely filed, Applicants hereby request the appropriate extension of time and hereby authorize payment of the required extension fee from Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,
ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP

By:

George N. Stevens, #36,938

GNS/rk Atty. Docket No. **050786** Suite 1000 1725 K Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006 (202) 659-2930

23850
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

H:\HOME\GSTEVENS\05\050786\Amendment 6-15-07